

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application; claims 10-18 are newly added. No new matter is added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for determining that the drawings are acceptable.

The applicants also thank the Examiner for pointing out a typographical error in the applicants' specification; the specification is correspondingly amended herein.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ling (WO 2004/023849) and Morgan et al. (USPA 2002/0145394, hereinafter Morgan). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The combination of Ling and Morgan fails to disclose automatically identifying a spatial position of each luminaire based on the one or more light measuring cells, as specifically claimed in independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-5, 7-8, and 16-17 depends, and independent claim 6, upon which claim 18 depends.

The Office action relies on Morgan for teaching the automatic identification of the spatial position of each luminaire, and asserts that Morgan provides this teaching at "the detail description of figs. 1 and 3" (Office action, page 3, lines 3-6). The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion, and respectfully note that this broad reference to over 250 lines of text in Morgan fails to satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2) and MPEP 707, which explicitly state that "When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable."

The applicants respectfully maintain that Morgan does not disclose automatically determining a spatial position of each luminaire, and in particular, the text cited in the Office action fails to address determining the position of each luminaire. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Morgan for teaching the automatic identification of a spatial position of each luminaire is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

The Office action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Morgan. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

The Office action asserts that Morgan's FIG. 2 discloses the method of claim 9. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Morgan's FIG. 2 discloses five steps:

- providing a lighting system (202),
- providing a programming device (204),
- selecting an address of the programming device (208),
- communicating the selected system address to the lighting system (210), and
- storing the communicated address in memory of the lighting system (212).

The applicants note that these cited five steps of Morgan fail to disclose the following elements of the applicants' claim 9:

- turning off all the luminaires,
- turning on a first luminaire and measuring by using a light detector the light intensity of the incident light and/or the direction from where the incident light originates, then turning off the first luminaire,
- turning on a next luminaire and measuring the light intensity of the incident light and/or the direction from where the incident light originates, then turning off the next luminaire,
- repeating the turning on of the next luminaire and measuring the light intensity until the at least one light intensity and direction has been measured for each of the luminaires, and
- determining a spatial position of each of the luminaires from the measured light intensities and/or directions.

Because Morgan's FIG. 2 does not disclose the elements of claim 9, as asserted in the Office action, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Morgan is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001